THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS'

MILLENNIAL STAR.

"*Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.*"—JESUS CHRIST.

No. 38. Vol. XXXII. Tuesday, September 20, 1870. Price One Penny.

SPEECH BY PRESIDENT GEO. A. SMITH,

DELIVERED IN THE TABERNACLE, SALT LAKE CITY, JULY 25, 1870.

THE 25th of July, 1847, if I recollect aright, was the Sabbath. The Pioneer company had spent one day after their arrival fairly in the valley. A water ditch had been constructed, and a dam put in the creek; a little plowing had been done. Several plows were broken in the first hour, owing to the dry state of the soil, trying to plow without irrigating. A few seeds were planted, but the work was very difficult. The Sabbath was a day of rest; the party, consisting of one hundred and forty-three Pioneers, a few women and two or three children, got together to a meeting within the circle of our corral. There being no other more convenient pulpit, discourses were delivered from a gun carriage, and this was our first day's worship. The Sacrament was administered, bread and water being distributed to the congregation; the land was dedicated, and hearty thanks returned to the Most High God for the privilege of kneeling down in peace, uninterrupted by enemies or the howl of mobs, and out of the reach of their violence, worshiping God in the way He had appointed. The country was barren, naked and uninhabited, except by a few nearly nude Indians. There were no provisions to be obtained except those which we had brought from beyond the Missouri river. It was under these circumstances that our first day's worship in the valleys of the mountains was celebrated.

When we look back at the history of our Puritan fathers, who landed on the shores of New England, they being non-conformists, and compelled to leave their home and country, we find them generally very zealous men, very devout, and jealous of their religious rights and privileges. They settled in a wilderness country, but enjoyed many facilities that we did not enjoy in this desert. The heavens condescended to water their lands with rains; the bays, rivers, inlets and seas around them abounded with fish, the ocean formed a highway by which they could send the timber, fish and other produce to market and bring them supplies from other countries. These circumstances were in their favor, and as if God had prepared the way before them, just previous to the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers a pestilence swept through the Indian tribes of New England and destroyed great numbers of them, reducing whole nations of Indians to a few scattered families. This no doubt prevented serious wars and difficulties which would have other-

wise taken place. Our Pilgrim Fathers undertook to establish a most rigid religious community. They were brought in contact with the mother country in consequence of their nonconformity to the established faith of the English church, and for generations were compelled to submit to indignities, insults, abuse and annoyances on that account. They were, however, in their way rather tyrannical, for whenever any person among them was disposed to criticise their faith, introduce new kinds of doctrine and make innovations in manners or language, they were treated with rigor and were whipped, imprisoned, banished or put to death. With all the strict discipline of these Puritans, their children degenerated to a great extent, running into a great variety of excesses. After the Latter-day Saints had been sifted five or six times, the Prophet tarred and feathered, in Hyrum, Portage County, driven from Kirtland, Ohio, by persecution, driven from Jackson and Clay Counties, Mo., expelled from the State of Missouri, from Illinois and eastern Iowa, deprived of all their property in these several drivings, they had become, to a considerable extent, sifted, so that those who came here were generally zealous and faithful in their hearts to the glorious cause in which they had enlisted. They were brought, however, in contact with new trials almost immediately. Many were hungry. Others who had but a scanty share of food were compelled to divide their morsel of bread with their brethren, and for years no person in the Territory scarcely dare eat a full meal of food. But they were healthy and God blessed them, smiled upon and prospered them and modified the climate. There were a very few who believed it possible to raise peaches or any delicate kind of fruit. Seeds were planted, however, by the advice of President Young, and they came forth after a contention or two with the crickets which destroyed the first nurseries; and so rigorous was the climate that the tops of the trees were killed, generally, from one to three feet every season, with the frost, and it was several years before the climate became such that the peach tree would escape injury from the frost. The same was the case with other fruits, which have spread abroad from this place into all the valleys in the Territory, and are now raised in many localities where formerly severe frosts could be expected every month in the year. The Lord having blessed and tempered the elements for our good, has a right to claim at our hands a due obedience to the holy principles of salvation which He has revealed unto us. He brought us here poor, robbed of our inheritances by intolerant men who deprived us of all that we possessed. We were almost naked and barefoot. We wore the skins of beasts and raw-hide soles. Thus we struggled in the midst of difficulties, but the Lord blessed and fed us in the midst of the desert. He sent supplies to us and enabled us to extend protection, shelter and food and the necessaries of life to thousands of our countrymen. Thousands and thousands would have perished on a pilgrimage to the West for gold. The Lord gave us the power to preserve the lives of our fellow countrymen, and aid them on their journey to California. With all these blessings, shall we be forgetful of our great and glorious duties? The smile of Heaven has been upon us. Here we have enjoyed religious liberty, the privileges of the Constitution guaranteed and made sacred to us by the blood of our forefathers, shed in the revolutionary cause to extend protection and liberty of conscience which we now enjoy, though denied to us in the States from which we were driven. We have here had the privilege of enjoying them, and under all circumstances it is our duty to extend liberty of conscience to every person, whoever he may be, who may reside under the dominion of our influence.

And we must ever remember that the holy principles of our religion which have been revealed to us for our salvation must be respected and observed, that we must live diligently in the discharge of those great duties and abide in the faith, wherein Christ has made us free, set before our children an example of temperance, patience, forbearance, industry and obedience to the commandments of God in all things, that life, intelligence and the

blessings of eternal life may be continued through our children to all future generations. While we consider these things we have every reason to rejoice, although the settlements have met with many obstacles. Some difficulties with the Indians have been entailed upon us, which we could not control. Emigrants passing through the country would occasionally shoot down an Indian, rob some squaw or commit some other outrage and pass on their way, and the friends of the Indians who had been killed or injured would seek redress at the hands of the settlers. Many difficulties of this kind have had to be met. Yet an amount of peace and harmony with the natives has been preserved which far exceeds what I believe can be found on the record of any other State or Territory, and is a record of which we have every reason to be proud. We have had to contend several times with the devouring insects.

When Mr. Morrill, in conversation with me in 1856, told me it was his intention to put through Congress an act to punish and prevent polygamy, I remarked that if Congress passed an act to prevent water from running out of our cañons, and enforced it, it would break up our settlements, for we could not live without water to irrigate our lands. God has given us the water; He has blessed it and we rejoice in it; and we have only to continue in the observance of faith and obedience to the principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ that we may enjoy life everlasting, and that we may enjoy peace and harmony and the privileges of the Constitution of our country, and do what has been predicted of us by our great prophet and martyred founder of our Church, Joseph Smith, namely, that when the principles of the Constitution should be torn in pieces and trampled under foot by the people, the Latter-day Saints would step forward and in a manner becoming their high and holy calling bear off triumphantly those glorious principles for which our fathers bled, and preserve them intact, transmitting them as a priceless inheritance to future generations, which may God grant for Christ's sake, Amen. —*Deseret News.*

CORRESPONDENCE ON THE SOCIAL CONDITION OF UTAH.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 582.)

You say, and I am perfectly satisfied you think no offence, that to your mind polygamic marriage is no marriage at all. I have not the slightest doubt that you honestly think so, yet error is common to the human mind, in some particulars even to minds of rare intelligence and sagacity, for the world by wisdom knows not God. Now, upon thorough consideration, how can you entertain such sentiments as you express concerning polygamic marriage? Do you not see that thereby you bastardize the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel and even the lineage of the Savior himself? You know that it was revealed to Moses that a bastard should not enter the congregation of the Lord until the tenth generation, and yet conceding your expressed views, the Lord chose bastards for the tribal heads of His chosen people. Something inconsistent here. I am sure that a sensible woman like yourself, upon mature reflection, will be inclined to modify your views upon this point, very materially.

I have referred you previously to authors, some of them of considerable note, who thought very differently to what you do upon this point. Allow me to refer a little more particularly. But first let me say that before me lies a very recently published work by a clergyman of Boston, U.S.A., upon *The History and Philosophy of Marriage; or Polygamy and Monogamy Compared*; in which the author maintains that long enduring peoples were always polygamic, that monogamy invariably brings nations to early decline, in consequence of the social evils at-

tendant on that form of marriage, and that polygamy is the only adequate remedy for those evils.

Grotius says, "The Jewish laws allow plurality of wives to one man. Among the Pagans few nations were content with one wife."

Selden says, "Polygamy was allowed, not only among the Hebrews, but in most other nations throughout the world; and that monogamy is a modern and a European custom, almost unknown to the ancient world."

Puffendorf says, "The polygamy of the fathers, under the old covenant, is an argument which ingenuous men must confess to be unanswerable."

Bishop Burnet says, "A plurality of wives was made in some cases a duty by Moses' law. I see nothing so strong against a plurality of wives as to balance the great and visible imminent hazards that hang over so many thousands, if it be not allowed."

Rev. Martin Madan says, "More than one wife, notwithstanding the seventh commandment, was allowed by God himself, who, however others might take it, must infallibly know his own mind, be perfectly acquainted with his own will, and thoroughly understand his own law. He blessed, and in a distinguished manner owned, the issue, and declared it legitimate to all intents and purposes." "While this system of a plurality of wives was reverenced and observed, we read of no adultery, whoredom, and common prostitution of women among the daughters of Israel; no brothels, street walking, venereal diseases; no child-murder, and those other appendages of female ruin which are too horrid to particularize. Nor were these things possible, which, since the revocation of the Divine system and the establishment of human systems, are become inevitable. The supposing our blessed Savior came to destroy the Divine law, or alter it with respect to marriage, is to suppose him laying a foundation for the misery and destruction of the weaker sex."

Rev. David A. Allen, D.D., a Congregationalist, and a Missionary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in his *India, Ancient and Modern*, says, "Polygamy is practised in India among the Hindoos, the Mohammedans, the Zoroastrians, and the Jews. It is allowed and recognized by the Institutes of Menu, by the Koran, by the Zendavesta, and, the Jews believe, by their Scriptures, the Old Testament. It is recognized by all the courts in India, native and English. The laws of the British Parliament recognize polygamy among all these classes, when the marriage connection has been formed according to the principles of their religion and to their established forms and usages. The marriage of a Hindoo or a Mohammedan with his second or third wife is just as valid and as legally binding on all parties as his marriage with his first wife; just as valid as the marriage of any Christian in the Church of England. . . . . This man cannot divorce any of his wives if he would, and it would be great injustice and cruelty to them and their children if he should. . . . . His having become a Christian and embraced a purer faith will not release him from those obligations in view of the English Government and courts, or of the native population. Should he put them away, or all but one, they will still be legally his wives, and cannot be married to another man. And further, they have done nothing to deserve such unkindness, cruelty, and disgrace at his hands."

Milton says, "Either therefore polygamy is a true marriage, or all children born in that state are spurious; which would include the whole race of Jacob, the twelve holy tribes chosen by God. But such an assertion would be absurd in the extreme, not to say impious." "Moreover God himself, in an allegorical fiction, Ezek. xxiii, 4, represents himself as having espoused two wives, Aholah and Aholibah," which he would not have done "if the practice which it implied had been intrinsically dishonorable or shameful." "Marriage is in the nature of a relation, and to one relation there can be no more than two parties. In the same sense therefore as if a man has many sons, his paternal relation towards them all is manifold, but towards each individually is single and complete in itself; by parity of reasoning, if a man has many wives, the relation which he bears to each will

not be less perfect in itself, nor will the husband be less *one flesh* with each of them, than if he had only one wife. Thus it might be properly said of Abraham, with regard to Sarah and Hagar respectively, *these twain were one flesh.*" "The expression may therefore be applied as properly to the husband who has many wives, as to him who has only one."

Speaking of a man's having more wives than one, Milton also says, "That he is in a condition to perform his conjugal duties to the one after having taken another to her, is shewn by God himself, Exod. xxi, 10, 'If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage, shall he not diminish.' It cannot be supposed that the Divine forethought intended to provide for adultery."

Milton continues—"Lastly, I argue as follows from Heb. xiii, 4. Polygamy is either marriage, or fornication, or adultery; the Apostle recognizes no fourth state. Reverence for so many patriarchs who were polygamists will, I trust, deter any one from considering it as fornication or adultery; for 'whoremongers and adulterers God will judge;' whereas the patriarchs were the objects of his especial favour, as he himself testifies. If, then, polygamy be marriage properly so called, it is also lawful and honourable, according to the same apostle: 'marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled.' It appears to me sufficiently established by the above arguments that polygamy is allowed by the law of God: lest however any doubt should remain, I will subjoin abundant examples of men whose holiness renders them fit patterns for imitation, and who are among the lights of our faith."

Here he gives numerous examples, concluding his argument as follows—"Who can believe, either that so many men of the highest character should have sinned through ignorance for so many ages; or that their hearts should have been so hardened; or that God should have tolerated such conduct in his people? Let therefore the rule received among theologians have the same weight here as in other cases: 'The practice of the Saints is the best interpretation of the commandments.'"

The Bible says, "Joash did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, all the days of Jehoiada the priest: and Jehoiada took for him two wives." Gideon, son of Joash, was called and highly favored of the Lord and was a mighty man of God, yet he had "threescore and ten sons of his body begotten: for he had many wives." The Lord through Nathan the Prophet said to David, "I gave thee thy master's (Saul's) wives into thy bosom, . . . and if that had been too little, I would moreover have given unto thee such and such things." God through Moses gave a law that if a man had two wives, the first-born son, no matter by which wife, should not be denied his birthright and inheritance, which could not be if both marriages were not valid. In no instance is it on record that Jesus Christ annulled the law of polygamic marriage, and he himself says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." So polygamy continued in the primitive Christian churches. It was a divine law, and therefore it was meet that it be fulfilled.

Polygamic marriage subserves every essential requirement of marriage, and, to say the least, while such multitudes of women abound for purposes of adultery and prostitution, surely no true woman, zealous for the real welfare of her sex, can object to women engaging in polygamic marriage. Adulterous men may, because such marriage strikes directly at the root of their guilty indulgences, curtailing their villainous and cowardly licence far more effectually than the prevalent monogamy does.

I am sure that, upon sufficiently mature reflection, you will conclude that polygamy is marriage, that it has been so accounted and provided for, ages upon ages, by both divine and human law. Scripture in no instance holds as illegitimate the offspring of polygamic marriage, but the offspring of associations of an adulterous nature were placed under express and exceedingly humiliating disabilities.

You say that in every great cause martyrs are needed, and that women must be "willing to starve in heart for want of love, as well as in body for want of food." I cannot say that it is fair to condemn women to such a terrible double starvation, for the sake of bringing the men to terms, to their senses, to a decent course of life. I think more good can be accomplished, even to the men, in a rather more agreeable way for the women, without necessarily subjecting the women to such a fearful fate as that which you propose. As to martyrs being needed in every great cause, perhaps it is so, but I seriously object to women being made the only martyrs. Let man chivalrously stand up, and in his vaunted capacity of "lord of creation" let him ex-officio step forward and sieze the martyr's crown. The Great Teacher said, "Whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be the servant of all. For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

Woman is martyred enough in the natural order of things, whether man properly aids in her development or not. Besides, my dear lady, women do "starve in heart for want of love" now, thousands and millions of them. You propose that they continue to starve, that more of them starve, in order to starve men into goodness. I cannot agree with that. I propose that the women starve no longer, that they be fed with the love they crave, which is as the bread of life to them, and that the truly honorable and benevolent among men be permitted and encouraged to step forward and feed them, according to the divine provision therefor—the love for want of which they starve in heart. Now pray excuse an Hibernianism if I say that no man who is a man can be a man if he sees a woman starving in heart as you suggest, and stands callously and cruelly aloof, refusing the assistance that is so much needed and that undeniably is in his possession, and it is in his power and within the line of his duty to bestow, provided the law does not prevent him.

I maintain that the least that can be done by good statesmanship and decent human nature is to place wholesome food within legal and honorable access of the starving. It is not in the nature of humanity to starve within reach of available sustenance. It is true that some appetites, practically denied proper aliment, will feed on garbage and carrion, yet what a dreadful thing it is to have the laws framed in such a foolish, wicked, cruel, tantalizing manner, as to place only the alternatives of such repugnant food or starvation before thousands of the best of your delicate and long and much suffering sex! Why it is horrible to contemplate! But this is the very condition of "woman in the nineteenth century" in monogamous Christendom!

I have heard women say that they would rather have bad men for husbands than none at all. Though the laws of Christendom place women in just such a pitiable predicament, yet the laws of God do not impose upon them such a disagreeable and unprofitable necessity. This is something to think of, to reflect upon, to ponder over with grave deliberation. It is not a subject to be pooh-poohed and flippantly cast aside, as of light and ephemeral importance, and I believe you are one of the few honorable persons who are disposed to allow to this vital subject something of the consideration which it undeniably deserves.

The laws of the land should be to encourage marriage and discourage adultery and prostitution, but, as it is, the laws of the most civilized countries decidedly discourage marriage and encourage adultery and prostitution, for while polygamic marriage is absolutely forbidden and punished by law, adultery is leniently regarded, and prostitution is actually legalized and carefully provided for.

Some say, "Stolen waters are sweet." I do not believe a word of it, nor that stolen bread is pleasant. If there is a fancied present sweetness or pleasure in either, that sweetness or pleasure is not only unreal, but it fills the soul with untold bitterness. I believe, yea, I do verily know, that there is an infinitude of unutterable pleasure and satisfaction, prospective, present, and retrospective, in that which is perfectly legitimate and honorable. Virtue is inalienably endowed with un-

speakable native loveliness, and vice is inalienably endowed with indescribable native deformity. Vice apes virtue, but virtue does not ape vice. Virtue, after all, is peace and satisfaction and joy and happiness and glory everlasting. No man, no woman, regrets the practice of virtue, but most, perhaps I should say all, at one time or another, regret, in greater or less degree, the practice of vice, so far as they have been guilty. Virtue is the winning game, vice is the losing game. Virtue is health and life, vice is disease and death. Virtue is proverbially fostered and promoted by marriage, most by divine polygamic marriage. Vice is indubitably encouraged and strengthened by forbiddings to marry and by unnatural restrictions upon marriage, yea, by monogamous restrictions upon marriage.

Practically wickedness would be immensely encouraged and strengthened by the rule of life you propose. An eminent American lady declares that at the present time an average of six vile men visit every vile woman. And there is no reason to suppose, unless the women be conjugally appropriated by better men, that the supply of inexperienced and otherwise procurable women will not continue to be forthcoming, as victims of bad men, to much the same extent as at present. Indeed, the signs of the times augur still more unfavorably than that for the women, I am sorry to say, in this country, and some others, and in this I have no doubt you will agree with me. For you do agree with me in several things, although I may believe in and understand the saving value of a few others which rather stagger your faith, because of the erroneous traditions in which you, like me, were educated, but which you, unlike me, have not yet got the better of by reducing them in your mind and by the light of heaven to something near their true value.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE NEWMAN-PRATT DISCUSSION.

Our readers understand that the Reverend Dr. J. P. Newman, Episcopal Methodist minister, who preaches in the chapel or church which President U. S. Grant attends at Washington, D.C., U.S.A., and is chaplain of the United States Senate, some time back announced that he was going to Salt Lake City to discuss with Brigham Young or Orson Pratt (sometimes the papers named one and sometimes the other) upon the subject of plurality of wives, and that a discussion of the kind came off between Messrs. Pratt and Newman in the New Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, Aug. 12, 13, 14. An abstract of the discussion and of the correspondence preceding it may be acceptable to those who take an interest in such things.

After Dr. Newman's arrival in Salt Lake City, in pursuance of his publicly announced purpose, he wrote to President Brigham Young that in acceptance of the challenge "given in your journal, the *Salt Lake Daily Telegraph*," he (Dr. Newman) was ready to hold a public debate with him (President Young) upon the question, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" under such regulations as might be mutually agreed upon, suggesting also that two gentlemen to represent each party meet to make the necessary arrangements without unnecessary delay.

President Young replied that he had never given any such challenge through the *Salt Lake Telegraph*, that this was the first information he had received of any such challenge, that the *Telegraph* was not his journal, but was owned and edited by Dr. Fuller, of Chicago, who was not a member of the Church, and that he (President Young) was not acquainted with the columns of that paper.

Dr. Newman wrote to President Young that he was disappointed at the answer, that people in the East were ignorant of the relations of Salt Lake papers with the Church, that the article in the copy of the *Telegraph* containing the supposed challenge, was so construed by the Doctor's friends, that

if he had not so construed it President Young could have adopted the *Telegraph* as his organ and declared the article a challenge which the Doctor could not or dared not accept, that the impression was general that such a challenge had been given and accepted, and that he (Dr. Newman) had acted under that impression.

President Young sent to Dr. Newman an invitation to preach in the Old Tabernacle at 10 a.m., or in the New Tabernacle at 2 p.m., or both on Sunday, Aug. 7.

Dr. Newman wrote to President Young that, as he had disclaimed or declined the discussion, he (Dr. Newman) had made other arrangements to preach on the day named, which precluded his compliance with the invitation.

President Young wrote to Dr. Newman, asking what right he had to say that he (President Young) had disclaimed or declined a discussion when no challenge had been given, or to assume as a challenge from him the writings of any unauthorized newspaper editor; stating that if the Doctor had distorted the article of the *Telegraph* into a challenge it was the duty of a gentleman to ascertain whether it was a real challenge before assuming that it was, that the insinuation that if the Doctor had not so construed the article he (President Young) could have adopted the *Telegraph* as his organ and declared the supposed challenge a real one was discreditable and extremely ungentlemanly and forced the conclusion that the author would not scruple to make use of such a subterfuge himself, that if, as the Doctor suggested, Mr. Sloan wrote the article he was capable of defending it, that the only person suggested in the article (Professor Orson Pratt) or hundreds of other fit and capable Elders would be willing to meet the Doctor in discussion, that the Doctor's distortion of the truth in accusing him (President Young) of disclaiming and declining a challenge never either given or contemplated would be considered by candid minds unfair and ungentlemanly and invented with some sinister motive or an attempt to gain notoriety regardless of truth; and inviting the Doctor, if he thought he could prove the doctrine of "plurality of wives unscriptural," to tarry at Salt Lake as a missionary, and he should be furnished with a suitable place, congregation, and plenty of Elders to discuss that or any other Scriptural doctrine with him.

The above correspondence all passed Aug. 6.

Dr. Newman wrote to President Young, Aug. 8, that he (Dr. Newman) was in the city for the purpose of discussing the question of polygamy with President Young or his representative, but that he (President Young) had declined such discussion, that consequently he (Dr. Newman) had engaged to preach elsewhere on Sunday, Aug. 7, that he regarded President Young's professed courtesy as a device to cover his unwillingness to have a fair discussion, that his comments upon "disclaiming and declining the discussion" he (Dr. Newman) would leave to a candid public, that the intimation that Elder Sloan, Professor Pratt, or hundreds of other Mormon Elders were willing to discuss and the "impertinent suggestion" that he (Dr. Newman) tarry as a missionary at Salt Lake he considered cheap and safe attempts to avoid the appearance of shrinking from a now impossible discussion, that he (Dr. Newman) went there with a since rudely dispelled understanding and expectation, that he had seen nothing in President Young's action assuring of sincerity but everything to cause distrust, that neither President Young nor Mormonism could afford him (Dr. Newman) any desirable notoriety. The Doctor then reiterated his views of the "simple history of the case," and declared that he had done with President Young.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

A cotemporary estimates that just now there is not much more than a hundred barrels of ink shed per day by American editors in elucidating the European war problem, and in enunciating strategic wisdom in solid chunks.

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS' MILLENNIAL STAR.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1870.

RELEASE.—Elder Richard Smyth has been released from his appointment as Travelling Elder in the Liverpool Conference, with permission to return home, his affairs there requiring his attention.

DEPARTURES.—The steamship *Nevada* left this port for New York, Sept. 14, with 26 souls of the Saints on board, most of them from Scandinavia, and who were prevented by stress of weather in the German Ocean from being here to embark the week previously on the *Idaho*. Included in the above company was Elder Richard Smyth, returning from his mission to this country. We wish them a pleasant and speedy journey.

THAT DISCUSSION.

REV. Dr. J. P. Newman, Chaplain of the United States Senate, seems to have fallen upon evil times, or they have fallen upon him, as is ultimately the case with most, if not all, of those ambitious gentlemen who attack Mormonism. The Doctor, with wonderful Quixotic zeal, posted off to Utah, proclaiming his intention to annihilate (figuratively) the Mormons and the divine system of a plurality of wives which they teach and endeavor to practise. Great things were expected of the redoubtable Doctor, when he should arrive under the shadows of the Wasatch, and it was doubtless supposed by many of his friends and well-wishers that he would promptly adopt and telegraph back to Washington the celebrated triumphal laconism of Cæsar—"I came, I saw, I conquered!"

But the Doctor and his friends appear to have been over-sanguine, and they now apparently have begun to discover that victory is not always to the sanguine. Indeed, soon after his arrival at Salt Lake he seems to have begun to surmise, what we could have told him from the first, that his vain-glorious expedition was not likely to afford him any desirable notoriety. That his surmises in that particular were well founded begins to be apparent to everybody, for we have not yet seen a single American paper that appears to have the slightest idea that he came off with flying colors in his widely vaunted assault upon the social system prevailing in Utah. Even previous to the discussion, some of the newspapers appeared to have no great faith in his prospects in the expedition. The New York *Star* says—

The Rev. Dr. Newman, of Washington, who expected to make a little cheap notoriety by attacking the lion in his den, the Brigham in his lair, arrived in Salt Lake City and notified Young that he was ready to open the discussion on the divine authority of polygamy. The Saint thereupon responded that

he never invited or consented to such discussion. The latter shows more gumption than his orthodox opponent. Controversy is the devil's weapon. It makes more sceptics than converts. The expectation that such a controversy would overturn the peculiar tenet of the Mormon religion was as chimerical as would be an attempt to "dam up the Nile with bullrushes," or to bolt a door with a boiled carrot.

The New York *World* evidently thinks the Utah people have no reason to be startled out of their propriety by the intellectually belligerent propensities of the Doctor. The *World* says—

The controversial Dr. Newman turns out by no means the harem-scarum person he was at first supposed at Salt Lake to be.

The New York *Tribune* thus rather deprecatingly discourses upon the discussion—

Since the days of chivalry we do not know that anything pluckier has been recorded than the visit of the Rev. J. P. Newman to Salt Lake City to do battle, logical and exegetical, with the wicked and obscene Dragon of Polygamy. It must have required a good deal of enthusiasm to go all that distance to refute what all virtuous persons consider to be an immorality, and all sensible persons an absurdity. But Mr. Newman was, in a manner, constrained to go. He had preached a sermon on the subject, which was heard of in Utah; whereupon the *Utah Telegraph* asked why he did not come to that territory to preach it "in the new Tabernacle, before 10,000 Mormons, with Orson Hyde or some other prominent Mormon to answer." Mr. Newman immediately packed his trunk, bought his railway-ticket, and started very much as Don Quixote would have done under like circumstances. But it was one thing to go to Utah, and quite another thing to get either Brigham or his man Orson to meet him in debate. Young, coolly, for August, replied that he had given no challenge; nor did the great Orson show any desire to enter the lists. Apparently, Mr. Newman had his long journey for his pains. But Young was too shrewd a man not to see that he had lost ground by declining the contest; and he therefore sent Mr. Newman an invitation to come and preach in the Tabernacle. Mr. Newman replied that he had already made arrangements to preach in the M. E. meeting-house. And he did preach there "for three mortal hours," in "a sweltering August afternoon," a sermon brimful of texts, to prove that there might be concubinage among the Jews, but that, in our sense of the word, they had no polygamy. Since then, the battle royal itself has finally been arranged and fought. In other columns we present the details.

We do not here attempt any abstract of the arguments. Much as we respect Mr. Newman, we do not consider that such of them as were drawn from the manners and customs of the Jews had any pertinence or consequence. We believe that, with Christianity came a better, and a nobler, and a purer Dispensation. The polygamy of the Jews, or the concubinage, was temporary and local, and not of Divine ordination. If otherwise, why do not the Jews, as a body, now practise it? They virtually acknowledge that there was no command of perpetual validity to maintain polygamy; for while, in matters of their law, they are nearly as strict as ever, they cheerfully obey our laws of marriage. To be sure, they could not do otherwise without being sent to the Penitentiary; but we have no reason to believe that they wish to do otherwise.

We prefer to base our hostility to polygamy upon the fact that all modern civilized nations are monogamous, so far as that word implies having one wife at a time. Mr. Newman shows that such is the doctrine of Christianity; and such being its doctrine, there is no room left for an argument.

The *Tribune* bases its hostility to polygamy upon the fact that all modern civilized nations are monogamous. To be consistent, the *Tribune* should be hostile to everything not practised by modern civilized nations. If this were the universal rule, then adieu to all further discovery, invention, or progress.

But the *Tribune* shrewdly speaks of those model nations being monogamous "so far as that word implies having one wife at one time," the *Tribune* knowing well enough that they are anything but monogamous so far as that word implies having more than one woman at a time. The *Tribune* appears to be dreadfully opposed to the virtuous and sanctifying and elevating act of marriage, but as easy as an old shoe respecting the sinful and debasing crime of unsanctified intimacy. So does the *Tribune* call good evil, and evil good.

The *Tribune* is in error when it says Mr. Newman shows that monogamy is the doctrine of Christianity. Mr. Newman does nothing of the kind, for that is not the doctrine of Christianity. If it were, the *Tribune* and modern civilized nations would be almost if not quite sure to reject it. But it may be the doctrine of the *Tribune*, Dr. Newman, and other uninspired religionists and theological speculators, chiefly because it is not the doctrine of Christianity.

We may say a word about the pluckiness of the Doctor's visit at another time.

The New York *Times* still more distinctly and emphatically deprecates the Doctor's adventure, and thinks that it must be written down a failure, indeed more, a triumph and exaltation of the "Mormon views of the marriage relation." The *Times* says—

The factitious importance which the discussion will give to the Mormon views of the marriage relation is greatly to be deprecated. By engaging in it Dr. Newman virtually admits that the laws prohibiting polygamy are based upon an interpretation, which may be right or wrong, of the Sacred Scriptures. The first words of the "articles of agreement" which are to bind the disputants, are, "The question to be discussed is" so and so; which imply a matter open to dispute, and, inferentially, make the issue of that dispute of importance in deciding whether polygamy should or should not be tolerated within our territories. That the tournament of quotations now in progress at Salt Lake will not in the least affect the marriage laws of the States, is but trifling consolation in view of the mischief which may be done to weak-minded people, who would repudiate the plainest dictum of common sense in the nineteenth century, if they were once convinced that it did not hold good in the time of the Flood. There is but little doubt that both the Mormon elder, Orson Pratt, and the anti-polygamous champion who opposes him, will each claim the victory when the fight is over. With every respect for Dr. Newman's good intentions, we cannot help feeling that, like the gallant Don, he will be obliged to see success where a scornful and unsympathetic public will see failure. Polygamy finds no favor among any people who have reached an advanced post in civilization. But its sturdiest enemies will be annoyed at the spectacle of a learned, earnest man sitting down gravely to dispute its Divine authorization with the leaders of a people who practice it in obedience to the pretended revelations vouchsafed to an illiterate imposter.

The "pretended revelations" and "illiterate imposter" style of writing is a very cheap one, not worth the orthodox penny a line, nor in any wise a credit to a respectable newspaper.

But the New York *Sun* pokes fun fast and cruelly at the Doctor and his friends, asserting that the Chaplain of the Senate is the politicians' tool for the purpose of blackmailing the Mormons, that Orson Pratt was treating Dr. Newman to a "sockdolager" similar to the one "Louis and I" have been experiencing from "our Fritz," and that the Doctor had been knocked about until he found himself floundering in water altogether too deep for him. The *Sun* thus gives vent to the alarm inspired at Washington by the discussion—

Washington, Aug. 25.—The controversy in which the Rev. Dr. Newman is

engaged in Salt Lake City with the Right Rev. Apostle Orson Pratt, on polygamy, does not give satisfaction here. It is plain that the "apostle" carries too many guns for the Chaplain of the Senate, and the consternation of those who sent him on his errand is as great as that of the confident French advocates of the "On to Berlin" cry, at the unexpected results of that little adventure.

It is very well understood here by the initiated that the "Mormon bill" was not intended ever to come to anything, and never will so long as Brigham Young's check is good for three millions of dollars; and he knows that as well as anybody. But he also knows what it costs him, and as his money is the Lord's, and as he is the Lord's steward, he is as chary as he can be with the Lord's money. It was considered necessary, therefore, to oblige him to bleed a little more freely next session, and the Rev. Mr. Newman was sent upon a polemical crusade, which, it was trusted, would have the effect of firing the religious mind of the country, and convincing Brigham of the necessity of submitting to more liberal blackmailing.

That discussion in the Salt Lake City Tabernacle, fully reported here, in truth inspires with disgust all who have at heart the interests of religion, or reverence for the Bible. The reverend Chaplain is already far out of his depth, and the controversy is already bordering on the legitimacy of incest, to the delight of scoffers and of those who have no regard for public propriety or even decency. It is justly asked: Why does Dr. Newman travel two thousand miles to the Western Sodom when so much work is left undone in his own stamping ground in the Gomorrah of Washington? Why does he not rather go, like the prophet of old, to men in high places, pointing out the heinous crime of those who, to subserve their private ends, are the cause of daily butcheries and devastation, and of their country's shame, and say to the Secretary of State "Thou art the man?" Why does he not go to his accomplice, Bancroft Davis, charging him for his soul's good to refund that $60,000, even if he could only impress him by the homely quotation:

"He who prigs wot isn't his'n,
When he is cotched, must go to prison?"

Why does he not stay at home to advise the Young Men's Christian Association of Washington not to invite or even admit women, because the *demi-monde* will creep in and afford unbelievers food for uncharitable and unpleasant surmises?

The hints about blackmailing are decidedly funny, and show that the *Sun* evidently believes in the popular doctrine that "money makes the mare to go," also that it makes politicians, parsons, and reverend doctors to "go," and that for such sordid reason did the Rev. Dr. Newman "go" to Salt Lake and "go" into that (for him) inauspicious and unfortunate discussion. The American papers are certainly pitching heavily into the Doctor, but it is written that the wicked shall slay the wicked, intellectually as well as corporeally we presume, although many of them commit acts of an indubitably felo-de-se-ical character, especially those would-be heroes who run a tilt against Mormonism. Perhaps men and women who claim a fair amount of intelligence will yet learn that to attack Mormonism is really the act of a felo-de-se. How many more examples will be necessary before the world will learn that important lesson?

J. J.

CORRESPONDENCE.

AUSTRALIA.

Melbourne, July 10, 1870.

President Albert Carrington.

Dear Brother—I am very sorry to tell you that our dear President, Elder Beauchamp, has had a severe attack

of fever since he went to Sydney, but I thank our heavenly Father that He has been pleased to restore him to health again. I think the sea, in a great measure, is the cause of his illness, as he says that he cannot eat while he is on board, and he has to travel a great deal by water.

We are all quite well in this city and enjoying the Spirit of God, but we are very few, and the people seem to be so well satisfied with their present state that I sometimes think that there are none of the seed of Joseph here. But I am very glad that there are some in Sydney and also in New Zealand, and I hope the day is not far distant when we shall have a periodical exit of the Saints from these lands to the vales of Utah, for I feel that the time is getting very short for people to get out of Babylon. I want to get to Zion before the troubles there are renewed, if there are to be any, and I may say that these are the feelings of all the Saints here, both men and women. But whichever way it is, we know it is all right, that our Father is at the helm on our side, whether Satan chooses to stir Brother Jonathan up with a stick or not, for we know that all things will work together for good to them that love God and keep His commandments.

I must conclude with our best love to you and brother Jaques and all in the Office, and may the God of Israel pour His choicest blessings on you and yours is the earnest prayer of your brothers in the bonds of peace,

EDWIN S. KEARSLEY,
SAMUEL CANT.

Sydney, July 12, 1870.

President Albert Carrington.

Dear Brother—Since my return from New Zealand I have been very ill, suffering from a raging fever, but through the mercy of our kind Father and the ordinances of the Church, I am again pretty well restored to health. I propose to give myself another week's rest and then to travel further into New South Wales, and hunt up the honest in heart.

I did intend to call a Conference before this, but I find it at present impossible, on account of the scattered and migrating population of these colonies. The Branches are hundreds and in some cases thousands of miles apart, and such is the floating nature of the population, that a Branch may be organized in a place to-day, having a dozen or more members, and in a little while there will not be left as many as would constitute a Branch. They are continually travelling about from one goldfield to another. I have therefore for the present deemed it wisdom to counsel the Branches to hold quarterly Conferences and to send me a correct report, from which I shall be able to gather sufficient information to send you a half-yearly statistical account of this mission. I have not done as much as I could wish, but I have done as much as I can single handed, and God helping me I will continue to do as much as I can until I have warned all the inhabitants of these lands and gathered out the honest in heart.

The following are the organizations of this mission, as it at present stands—Sydney Branch, members 18, Elders 4, teachers 2, Elder James Pegg President of Conference, Elder Richard Ellis President of Sydney Branch and book agent; Melbourne, Victoria, members 16, Elders 6, Samuel Cant President of Branch and book agent; New Zealand, Karori Branch, members 24, Elders 3, teachers 2, Henry Allington President of Branch and book agent (all but three new members); Kaiapoi, members 10, Elders 2, Wm. Burnett President of Branch and President of Conference. Of these 32 are new members, never having been in the Church before. The remainder are old members, some of whom have been rebaptized. All are in good standing and are trying hard to be ready to gather to Zion next May. There are many old and some new Saints who have left their former places of residence and are for the present lost sight of, but I will try and hunt them up and teach them better, and if possible prevent a recurrence. These are not numbered in my report.

I feel first-rate in the work I have been appointed to, and desire with all my heart to do it in a manner to receive the approbation of our Father in heaven and the authorities in and from Zion. The Saints in this part of

our Lord's vineyard are all honest and earnest; and in respectability, intelligence, and moral standing before the world will compare favorably with any community of people in the world, out of Utah. They are faithful and obedient to counsel and give me their utmost confidence. They sympathize sincerely with the Saints in Utah and long to be with them, to share their trials, that they may also partake with them of the blessings of the kingdom of our God. That our good Father in heaven may deliver them soon, is my prayer in the name of Jesus our Redeemer. Amen.

Australia is not now the Eldorado it was fifteen years ago. The goldfields are getting all worked out, and one hears on every hand complaints of the great depression of business. Bankruptcies are of every-day occurrence, and meetings of the unemployed frequently take place, "begging their brothers of the earth to give them leave to toil." Oh, if they would but hearken to the warning voice of the servants of God and obey the Gospel of His Son, what misery and ruin they might spare themselves, their children and their children's children to the latest generation! If I had the voice of an archangel or the trump of God, I would cry repentance to this generation; I would roar in their ears, "Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die? Repent, repent of your sins and your follies, be baptized for the remission of them, receive the laying on of the hands of those who have the authority and power to communicate to you the Holy Ghost, then gather to Zion, the home of the Saints, and you shall see the salvation of God, while He destroys the wicked from off the earth."

Though the wicked persecute, self-righteous Pharisees abuse, unprincipled scribes lie, and all Babylon howl with rage, the work of God will roll on, and His servants will still continue to cry repentance to this generation. Come out of Babylon, ye honest-hearted ones, lest ye partake of her sins and receive of her plagues. Fear God and give glory to Him, for the hour of His judgments is come. God has prepared a place of refuge for you, poor, despised, down-trodden producers of wealth—a place of peace and love, and men, women and children, who have ceased to be satisfied in the service of Satan, are gathering to it as doves to the windows, from every kindred, tongue and people, to assist in building up the kingdom of God upon earth, that His will may be done on earth as it is done in heaven, and man's love to God be manifest in man's love to man. Come then, out of foul Babylon. Leave her with her vice, oppression and misery, to the destroying judgments of an offended God, which will ere long shake terribly the earth, and gather ye to the Zion of our God, established in the mountains in America.

I bear my testimony honestly to my fellow men that this is the work of God, and that it has been revealed in these last days, with the fulness of the everlasting Gospel, by an angel flying in the midst of heaven, and all who will obey it shall know for themselves that this testimony is true and faithful. God bless all the honest in heart.

With sincere prayers for the speedy triumph of Zion and the final overthrow of Babylon, I remain as ever, your obedient brother and faithful fellow laborer in the cause of truth and righteousness, "peace on earth, and good will towards man,"

ROBERT BEAUCHAMP.

AT SEA.

S.S. *Idaho*, off Queenstown, Sept. 8, 1870.

President Horace S. Eldredge.

Dear Brother—We have got this far on our journey without any trouble save a little sea-sickness, &c. The Saints are now on deck, and it makes a great improvement in those who are inclined to be sick. All are in the best of spirits. The brethren all join in kind regards to yourself and all at 42.

Your brother in the Gospel,

F. H. HYDE.

S.S. *Idaho*, Sept. 8, 1870.

Dear Brother Jaques—We weighed anchor last evening at 5.10, and proceeded down the river all in jubilant spirits, with the prospect of soon reaching our beloved mountain home. We had not proceeded far before some

commenced to cast up their accounts. The Saints feel well, and I trust that we shall have a pleasant and happy voyage.

May the blessings of Israel's God attend you, also President Eldredge, in which all the brethren join.

Your friend and brother in the Gospel of Christ,

GEO. ROMNEY.

AMERICA.

Williamsburg, New York, Aug. 20, 1870.

President Horace S. Eldredge.

Dear Brother—Please to insert in the STAR that from this time the number of the Post-office Box for this (Williamsburg) Branch will be 152, instead of 136, as Box 136 was taken in the name of Colin McPherson, who has been excommunicated for apostacy. For the future address to Box 152 any books, STARS, or anything that may be sent to this Branch by way of post-office.

Yours truly in the Gospel of Christ,

WM. SEARLE.

UTAH NEWS.

THE following are from the *Deseret News* to Aug. 26:—

Gov. Shaffer started for the west, Aug. 22.

Cool weather was prevailing at Salt Lake City.

Messrs. Margetts and Bowring had opened the Theatre as lessees.

Elder Wm. C. Staines left Salt Lake City, Aug. 23, on his return to New York.

Hon. W. H. Seward arrived at Salt Lake City, Aug. 20, *en route* for China. A car was placed at his disposal by the U.C.R.R.

Thomas Jefferson Thurston, jun., at Milton, on the Weber, was shot by John Olsen, Aug. 19. Thurston died the next morning.

A son of brother Thos. Chorley, of Cedar City, Iron County, was dangerously sun-struck, but it was believed he would eventually recover.

Kanosh, Indian chief, had paid a visit to the city. He had recovered from the accident to his hand, after one of his fingers had been amputated.

President Joseph and Elder Seymour B. Young arrived at Salt Lake City Aug. 25. The *News* says, "They have enjoyed excellent health during their absence, and have had a splendid time on their mission, and we do not remember seeing brother Joseph look so hale and hearty as he looks at the present time. We are glad to welcome brother Joseph back. As long ago as the days of Kirtland it was predicted that he should take a mission to Europe, and he has finally accomplished it in his 74th year."

A letter from St. George, Aug. 11, said that brother Geo. Gould reported that a deputy sheriff from Pioche, with three men, went to the co-operative store at Panacca, and demanded from the clerk a list of the stock of goods, with a view to exact license in behalf of the State of Nevada. They were refused the list by the clerk, and, after drawing and cocking their pistols and pointing them at the clerk and at brothers Gould, Adams and Lufkin, who were by-standers, they made the brethren leave the store and locked it up, giving the key in charge of one of their party, while the remainder made for home. The brethren were all engaged at the time on their water sect, and, upon hearing of the affair, collected and armed themselves. They sent the constable to the man who held the key, who gave it up without any remonstrance. The deputy sheriff, while at the store, also read a summons from the Justice of the Peace of Pioche, requiring J. W. Morton, as the agent of the co-operative store, to appear at Pioche, Aug. 11. The brethren were advised to stand their ground, and sue a writ of injunction when opportunity offers.